TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1902 1904

No. 1[illegible]. 2[illegible] 38.

THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY ET AL., PLAINTIFFS IN ERROR,

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS.

IN ERROR TO THE COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS IN AND FOR THE THIRD SUPREME JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF TEXAS.

FILED MAY 15, 1903.

(18,935.)

(18,935.)

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1902.

No. 707.

THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY ET AL., PLAINTIFFS IN ERROR,

vs.

THE STATE OF TEXAS.

IN ERROR TO THE COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS IN AND FOR THE THIRD SUPREME JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF TEXAS.

INDEX.

	Original.	Print.
Proceedings in district court	1	1
Caption	1	1
Plaintiff's first amended original petition	1	1
Defendant's original answer	4	3
Judgment	9	6
Appeal bond	10	7
Defendant's assignment of errors	11	8
Bill of costs	14	10
Certificate of district clerk	14	10
Proceedings in court of civil appeals	15	11
Order submitting case	15	11
Opinion	16	11
Judgment	17	12
Motion for rehearing	17	12
Order submitting motion for rehearing	25	18
Order overruling motion for rehearing	25	18

JUDD & DETWEILER, PRINTERS, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 18, 1903.

	Original.	Print
Proceedings in supreme court	26	18
Judgment	26	18
Bill of costs	27	19
Proceedings in court of civil appeals	28	19
Writ of error bond	28	19
Duplicate writ of error	30	21
Assignment of errors	31	22
Bill of costs	34	23
Clerk's certificate	35	24
Petition for writ of error	36	24
Original writ of error	40	26
Citation and service	43	27

1 *Caption.*

THE STATE OF TEXAS, }
County of Travis. }

At a term of the district court of the 53rd judicial district of Texas, begun and holden at Austin, within and for the county of Travis, before the Honorable F. G. Morris, and which is still in session, the following case came on for trial, towit:

THE STATE OF TEXAS
vs.
THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY. } No. 18055.

Plaintiff's First Amended Original Petition.

Filed June 2nd, 1902.

In the Name of the State of Texas.

In the District Court of Travis County, 53rd Judicial District of Texas.

THE STATE OF TEXAS
vs.
SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY.

To the Hon. F. G. Morris, judge of said court:

Now comes the plaintiff, The State of Texas, and leave of the court being first had and obtained files this her first amended original petition, and respectfully represents as follows:

The State of Texas, plaintiff herein, at the relation of C. K. Bell, attorney general, and appearing herein by her said attorney general and Warren W. Moore, district attorney in and for the 26th judicial district of the State of Texas and by D. A. McFall, attorney at law, complaining of the Southern Cotton Oil Company, defendant, represents:

I.

That the Southern Cotton Oil Company is a corporation duly organized, chartered and existing under the laws of the State
2 of New Jersey, and that said company is duly authorized and empowered to transact business in the State of Texas by reason of a permit heretofore, towit: on the 3rd day of June, 1897, issued to it by the State of Texas, authorizing it to transact business in this State in accordance with its charter and with the constitution and laws of the State of Texas, which corporation has heretofore been duly cited in this cause and answered herein.

That the National Cotton Oil Company is a corporation duly

organized, chartered and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, and that said company is duly authorized and empowered to do and transact business in the State of Texas by reason of a permit heretofore, towit: on the 2nd day of May, 1900, issued to it by the State of Texas, authorizing it to transact business in this State in accordance with its charter and with the constitution and laws of the State of Texas.

That the Taylor Cotton Oil Works is a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Texas, by virtue of a charter granted by the State of Texas on the 25th day of August, 1898, authorizing and empowering it to transact business as such corporation, in accordance with its charter and with the constitution and laws of the State of Texas.

II.

That each of said foreign corporations *were*, from the time of the issuance of the permits authorizing them to do business in the State of Texas, and has ever since been and is still engaged, and the Taylor Cotton Oil Works from the date of its charter has been and is still engaged in the business of the manufacture and sale of cotton seed oil, cotton seed meal and other bi-products of cotton seed; that the business in which each and all of said corporations were engaged necessitated the purchase of cotton seed from which the products which they manufactured and sold were made, and that said cotton seed was an article and commodity of merchandise.

III.

That heretofore, towit: on or about the first day of No-
3 vember, 1901, and on each and every day prior and subsequent thereto since the 2nd day of May, 1900, said corporations were and have been engaged in the business of buying cotton seed in the various counties of the State of Texas; that on or about the 1st day of November, 1901, the Southern Cotton Oil Company made and entered into a combination with each of the other of said corporations, and that each of the other of said corporations made and entered into a combination with the said Southern Cotton Oil Company and with each other, and that each of said corporations made and entered into a combination with various other persons, firms and corporations whose names are to the plaintiff unknown, and that said corporations became members of and parties to a pool, trust, agreement, confederation and understanding with each of the other of said corporations, firms and persons, whereby they did each for itself and with each of the others respectively and all together, agreed to regulate and fix and did regulate and fix the price at which they would buy cotton seed throughout the State of Texas, at $14.00 per ton, and agreed amongst and with each other that they would not give more than said $14.00 per ton for cotton seed in any of the towns and communities of the State of Texas.

IV.

That by creating and entering into and becoming a member of and a party to such pool, trust, agreement, combination, confederation and understanding with said other persons, firms and corporations aforesaid and by maintaining the agreement to regulate and fix the price of cotton seed as aforesaid, the defendant was guilty of a violation of the laws of the State of Texas; that the defendant, in consequence of the acts hereinbefore complained of, has forfeited its permit to transact business in the State of Texas.

Wherefore, premises considered, plaintiff prays, defendant having already answered herein, that it have judgment, that the permit of said defendant authorizing it to transact business in the State of Texas be canceled and forfeited, and the defendant enjoined
4 from transacting business in the State of Texas, for costs, and for all further relief, to which plaintiff may be entitled in law or in equity.

C. K. BELL,
Attorney General,
W. W. MOORE,
District Attorney,
D. A. McFALL,
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

(Endorsed:) No. 18055. The State of Texas *vs.* Southern Cotton Oil Company. Suit to cancel permit. Plaintiff's first amended original petition. Filed June 2, 1902, in dist. court, Travis Co., Texas, 53 jud. district. Jas. P. Hart, clerk, by J. H. Hart, deputy.

Defendant's Original Answer.

Filed June 2nd, 1902.

THE STATE OF TEXAS
vs.
THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY. } No. —.

The Southern Cotton Oil Company, defendant, comes by its attorneys and demurs to plaintiff's petition herein upon the following grounds, viz:

I. The allegations of plaintiff's petition are insufficient in law to entitle plaintiff to any relief, or to require defendant to further answer herein.

II. There is no valid law of the State of Texas prohibiting the acts complained of in plaintiff's petition.

III. The act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled "An act to define trusts and to provide for penalties and punishment of corporations, persons, firms and associations of persons connected with them, and to promote free competition in the State of Texas," approved March 30th, 1889, and articles 976, 977, 978, 979, 980,

981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, and 988 of the Penal Code of the State of Texas based upon said act are in contravention of that provision of section 1 of article XIV of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States which provide that no State
5 shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, because (1) by section 13 of said act and article 988 of said Penal Code, it is provided that the said statutes "shall not apply to agricultural products or live stock while in the hands of the producer or raiser,"—wherefore defendant says that said statutes arbitrarily discriminate against it and its stockholders in favor of other classes, towit: the producers and raisers of live stock and agricultural products without any just reason, and thereby deny defendant and its stockholders the equal protection of the laws; and (2) because the penalties prescribed by said statutes for the violation of their provisions are so excessive and the provisions thereof purporting to define the acts to be thus punished are so vague and uncertain that defendant is denied the right to resort to the judicial tribunals of the country to defend the legality of its acts in the conduct of its business, except upon the condition that if not successful it shall subject all its property in this State to confiscation and forfeit its right to do business in this State; wherefore, defendant says that said statutes operate to deprive it of its property without due process of law and to deny it the equal protection of the laws.

IV. The act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled "An act to define trusts, provide for penalties and punishment of corporations, persons, firms and associations of persons connected with them, and to promote free competition in the State of Texas, and to repeal all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act," approved April 30th, 1895, and articles 5313, 5314, 5315, 5316, 5317, 5318, 5319, 5320 and 5321 of the Revised Statutes of Texas and 988*a*, 988*b*, 988*c*, 988*d* of the Penal Code based upon said act of April 30th, 1895, are in contravention of that provision of section 1 of article XIV of the amendments of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the
6 laws, because (1) by section 12 of said act, and article 5320 of the Revised Statutes and article 988 of the Penal Code, it is provided that the said statutes "shall not be held to apply to live stock and agricultural products in the hands of the producer or raiser" nor "be understood or construed to prevent the organization of laborers for the purpose of maintaining any standard of wages,"—wherefore, defendant says that the said statutes arbitrarily discriminate against it and its stockholders in favor of other classes, towit: producers and raisers of livestock and agricultural products and laborers, without any just reason, and thereby deny defendant and its stockholders the equal protection of the laws; and (2) because the penalties prescribed by said statutes for the violation of their

provisions are so excessive and the provisions thereof purporting to define the acts to be thus punished are so vague and uncertain that defendant is denied the right of resort to the judicial tribunals of the country to defend the legality of its acts in the conduct of its business, except upon the condition that if not successful it shall subject all its property in this State to confiscation and forfeit its right to do business in this State,—wherefore, defendant says that said statutes operate to deprive it of its property without due process of law, and to deny it the equal protection of the laws.

V. The act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled "An act to prohibit pools, monopolies and conspiracies to control business and prices of articles; to prevent the formation of pools, trusts, monopolies and combinations of charters of corporations that violates the terms of this act, and to authorize the institution of prosecutions and suits therefor," approved May 25th, 1899, is in contravention of that provision of section 1 of article XIV of the amendments of the Constitution of the United States which provides that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, because (1) by section 12 of the act of
7 the legislature of Texas entitled, "An act to define trusts, provide for penalties and punishment of corporations, persons, firms and associations of persons connected with them and to promote free competition in the State of Texas, and to repeal all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act," approved April 30th, 1895, and by article 5320 of the Revised Statutes of the State of Texas, and by article 988 of the Penal Code of the State of Texas, none of which have been repealed, and to all of which the said act approved May 25th, 1899, is cumulative and is a mere supplement and with which it is in *pari materia*, it was and is expressly provided that the said statutes shall not be held to apply to live stock and agricultural products in the hands of the producer or raiser, nor to the organization of laborers, for the purpose of maintaining any standard of wages,—wherefore defendant says that the said statutes arbitrarily discriminate against it and its stockholders in favor of other classes, towit: producers and raisers of live stock and agricultural products and laborers without any just reason; and thereby deny defendant and its stockholders the equal protection of the laws; and (2) because the penalties prescribed by said statutes for the violation of their provisions are so excessive and the provisions thereof purporting to define the acts to be thus punished are so vague and uncertain that defendant is denied the right of resort to the judicial tribunals of the country to defend the legality of its acts in the conduct of its business, except upon the condition if not successful it shall subject all its property in this State to confiscation and forfeit its right to do business in this State; wherefore, defendant says that said statutes operate to deprive it of its property without due process of law and to deny it the equal protection of the laws.

VI. The act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled "An

act to prohibit pools, trusts, monopolies and conspiracies to
8 control business and prices of articles; to prevent the formation of pools, trust-, monopolies and combinations of charters of corporations that violates the terms of this act and to authorize the institution of prosecution- and suits therefor," approved May 25th, 1899, is in contravention of section 35, article III of the constitution of the State of Texas which provides that "No bill (except general appropriation bills which may embrace the various subjects and accounts for and on account of which moneys are appropriated) shall contain more than one subject, which shall be expressed in its title. But if any subject shall be embraced in an act which shall not be expressed in the title such act shall be void only as to so much thereof as shall not be so expressed," because (1) the title of said act is incomplete and unintelligible; and (2) said act provides for the forfeiture of the corporate rights and franchises of all domestic corporations and for the forfeiture of the right and privilege of all foreign corporations to do any business in this State, and in addition thereto, prescribes severe pecuniary fines and penalties for the violation of the said statute while no such subject is expressed in the title of said act.

And of all these demurrers, and of each ground therefor, defendant prays judgment of the court.

HUTCHESON, CAMPBELL & HUTCHESON,
Attorneys for the Southern Cotton Oil Company, Defendant.

(Endorsed:) No. 18,055. The State of Texas *vs.* The Southern Cotton Oil Company. Original answer of the Southern Cotton Oil Company. Filed June 2, 1902. Jas. P. Hart, clerk, by J. H. Hart, deputy.

9 *Judgment.*

June 2nd, 1902.

THE STATE OF TEXAS
vs.
THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY. } No. 18055.

This cause came on to be heard on this the 2nd day of June, 1902, when plaintiff, The State of Texas, appeared by her attorney general and by W. W. Moore, dist. att'y, and D. A. McFall, and defendant The Southern Cotton Oil Company appeared by its attorneys; and both parties announced ready for trial; thereupon came on to be heard the defendant's demurrers to plaintiff's petition and after hearing the said petition and demurrers and argument of counsel thereon, and after due consideration thereof, the court is of the opinion that the law is with the plaintiff; and,

It is therefore adjudged and decreed that defendant's demurrers to plaintiff's petition be and the same are each and all hereby overruled; to which ruling the defendant excepts; and the defendant

declining to further answer herein, the court is of the opinion that plaintiff is entitled to all the relief prayed for in its petition;

It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the license or permit granted by plaintiff, The State of Texas, as described or referred to in its petition herein to the defendant The Southern Cotton Oil Company to transact or carry on business within the State of Texas, be and the same is hereby forfeited, revoked and canceled and is adjudged to be of no further force, validity or effect whatever and that the defendant is enjoined from transacting business in the State of Texas, except such business as may be and constitute interstate commerce, and,

It is further ordered and adjudged that plaintiff recover of defendant all the costs of this suit, for which let execution issue.

To all of which defendant excepts and in open court gives notice of appeal to the court of civil appeals in and for the third
10 supreme judicial district.

Appeal Bond.

Filed June 2nd, 1902.

In Travis County District Court, Fifty-third Judicial District.

STATE OF TEXAS
vs.
THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY. } No. 18055.

Whereas, in the above numbered and entitled cause pending in the fifty-third judicial district court in and for Travis county, and at a regular term of said court, towit: on the 2nd day of June, 1902, the State of Texas recovered judgment against the Southern Cotton Oil Company forfeiting, canceling and revoking the permit or license of said company to transact business in the State of Texas, and enjoining it from transacting any business in the State of Texas, except such business as may be and constitute interstate commerce, and for all costs of suit, from which judgment the Southern Cotton Oil Company has taken an appeal to the court of civil appeals for the third supreme judicial district, and desires to suspend the execution of said judgment during the pendency of said appeal;

Now, therefore, we, the Southern Cotton Oil Company, as principal, and I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith, as sureties, acknowledge ourselves bound to pay the State of Texas the sum of seven thousand dollars, conditioned that The Southern Cotton Oil Company, appellant, shall prosecute its appeal with effect, and in case the judgment of the supreme court or the court of civil — shall be against it, it shall perform its judgment, sentence or decree and pay all such damages as said court may award against it.

11 Witness our hands this 2nd day of June, A. D. 1902.

THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY,
By HUTCHESON, CAMPBELL & HUTCHESON,
Its Attorneys of Record.

I. W. WALKER, *Surety.*
HOWARD F. SMITH, *Surety.*

Approved June 2nd, 1902.

JAS. P. HART, *Clerk.*

(Endorsed:) No. 18055. State of Texas *vs.* The Southern Cotton Oil Co. Bond. Filed June 2nd, 1902. Jas. P. Hart, clerk.

Defendant's Assignment of Errors.

Filed June 4th, 1902.

STATE OF TEXAS
vs.
THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY. } No. 18055.

Now comes The Southern Cotton Oil Company, defendant in the above numbered and entitled cause, and on its appeal herein assigns errors committed upon the trial of this cause as follows, towit:

First.

The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer numbered III to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that the act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled "An act to define trusts and provide for penalties and punishment of corporations, persons, firms and associations of persons connected with them, and to promote free competition in the State of Texas," approved March 30th, 1899, and articles 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987 and 988 of the Penal Code of the State of Texas, based upon said act are in contravention of that provision of sec-
12 tion 1 of article XIV of the amendments of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Second.

The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer numbered IV to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that the act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled "An act to define trusts, provide for penalties and punishment of corporations, persons, firms and associations of persons connected with them, and to promote free competition in the State of Texas, and to repeal all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act," approved April 30th, 1895, and articles 5313, 5314, 5315, 5316, 5317, 5318, 5319, 5320 and 5321 of the Revised Statutes of Texas, and 988*a*, 988*b*, 988*c*, and 988*d* of the Penal Code of said State, based upon said act of April 30th, 1895, are in contravention of that provision of section 1, article IV of the amendments of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the laws.

Third.

The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer numbered V to plaintiff's petition based upon the ground that the act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled, "An act to prohibit pools, trusts, monopolies and conspiracies to control business and prices of articles; to prevent the formation or operation of pools, trusts, monopolies and combinations of charters of corporations that violates the terms of this act, and to authorize the institution of prosecutions and suits therefor," approved May 25th, 1899, is in contravention of that provision of section 1 of article XIV of the amendments of the Constitution of the United States which provides that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due
13 process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Fourth.

The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer numbered VI to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that the act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled "An act to prohibit pools, trusts, monopolies and conspiracies to control business and prices of articles; to prevent the formation or operation of pools, trusts, monopolies, and combinations of charters of corporations that violates the terms of this act, and to authorize the institution of prosecutions and suits therefor," approved May 25th, 1899, is in contravention of section 35 of article III of the constitution of the State of Texas.

Fifth.

The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer numbered II to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that there is no valid law of the State of Texas prohibiting the acts complained of in plaintiff's petition.

Sixth.

The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer numbered I to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that the allegations of said petition were insufficient in law to entitle plaintiff to any relief or to require defendant to further answer.

Seventh.

The court erred in rendering judgment against defendant and in not rendering judgment that plaintiff take nothing by its suit herein.

Wherefore, The Souther- Cotton Oil Company, defendant, prays that the judgment against it be reversed and that final judgment be rendered in its favor.

HUTCHESON, CAMBBELL & HUTCHESON,
Attorneys for Southern Cotton Oil Company,
Defendant and Appellant.

(Endorsed:) No. 18,055. State of Texas *vs.* Southern Cotton Oil Company. Defendant's assignment of errors. Filed June 4th, 1902. Jas. P. Hart, clerk, by D. J. Pickle, deputy.

14 *Bill of Costs.*

THE STATE OF TEXAS
vs.
THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY. } No. 18055.

To officers of court, Dr.

Clerk's Costs.

	Dolls.	Cts
Docketing suit		.20
Entering appearances		.30
Filing papers		.60
Entering judgment		1.15
Approving bond		1.50
Transcript		8.50
Assessing damages		.50
Filing & certifying brief		.90
Taxing costs		.25
		$13.90

Sheriff's Costs.

J. M. Davis, sheriff, venire fee	.50
Total	$14.40

Clerk's Certificate.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, }
County of Travis. }

I, Jas. P. Hart, clerk of the district court, within and for the county and State aforesaid, do hereby certify that the within and foregoing on 16 pages is a true and correct transcript of all the proceedings had in this court in cause No. 18055, of The State of Texas *vs.* The Southern Cotton Oil Company, as the same ap-
15 pear of record and on file in this office.

Given under my hand and seal of office, at Austin, Texas, this the 4th day of June, A. D. 1902.

JAS. P. HART,
[SEAL.] *Clerk District Court, Travis County, Texas.*

(Endorsed:) No. 2927. The Southern Cotton Oil Company, appellant, *vs.* The State of Texas, appellee. From the district court of Travis county, for the 53rd judicial district of Texas. Applied for by Messrs. Hutchison, Campbell & Hutchison, attorney- for appel-

lants on the 5th day of June, A. D. 1902, and delivered to above named attorneys on the 5th day of June, 1902. Jas. P. Hart, clerk of the district court of Travis county. Filed in court of civil appeals, 3rd supreme judicial district, Austin, Texas, Aug. 16, 1902. R. H. Connerly, clerk.

PROCEEDINGS IN COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS.

Order Submitting Case.

Made January 28, 1903.

SOUTHERN COTTON OIL CO. *vs.* STATE OF TEXAS. } No. 2927.

Appeal from Travis county.

Submitted on briefs of both parties.

16 *Opinion of Court of Civil Appeals.*

Filed February 4th, 1903.

THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY, Appellant, *vs.* THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee. } No. 2927.

Appeal from the district court of Travis county.

Opinion.

The State instituted this proceeding to forfeit the permit of the Southern Cotton Oil Company, a foreign corporation, to do business in Texas, on account of certain alleged violations of the anti-trust laws of Texas. No other relief was sought, except the forfeiture of said permit.

Appellant presented several special exceptions, assailing as unconstitutional the several acts of the legislature relied upon by the State. These exceptions were overruled, and appellant declining to amend, judgment was entered for the State canceling the permit, from which this appeal is prosecuted.

The only questions presented relate to the constitutionality of the various anti-trust laws of our State. In the case of The State *vs.* The Shippers Compress & Warehouse Co., (5 Tex. Crt. Rep. 182) the Supreme Court decides that the acts in question are constitutional, in so far as they relate to a proceeding to forfeit the charter of a domestic corporation or to cancel the permit of a foreign corpora-

tion, and that being the only relief sought or obtained in this case, the judgment is accordingly affirmed.

Affirmed.

SAM STREETMAN,
Associate Justice.

(Endorsed:) No. 2927. Southern Cotton Oil Company *vs.* The State of Texas. Appeal from Travis county. Opinion. Affirmed. Filed in court of civil appeals, 3rd supreme judicial district,
17 Austin, Texas, Feb. 4, 1903. R. H. Connerly, clerk. Filed in supreme court Mar. 31, 1903. F. T. Connerly, clerk.

Judgment of Court of Civil Appeals.

Rendered February 4th, 1903.

SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY
vs.
THE STATE OF TEXAS. } No. 2927.

Appeal from district court of Travis county.

Opinion by Associate Justice Streetman.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record, and, the same being inspected, because it is the opinion of the court that there was no error in the judgment: it is therefore considered, adjudged and ordered that the judgment of the court below be in all things affirmed; that the appellant, The Southern Cotton Oil Company, principal, and its sureties, I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith, pay all costs in this behalf expended, and this decision be certified below for observance.

Motion for Rehearing.

Filed February 17th, 1903.

In the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District.

SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY, Appellant,
vs.
STATE OF TEXAS.

Appeal from Travis county district court, 53rd district.

18 Now comes The Southern Cotton Oil Company, appellant in this cause, and moves the court to set aside the judgment heretofore rendered herein affirming the judgment of the district court and to grant appellant a rehearing upon the grounds following, that is to say:

First.

The court erred in refusing to sustain appellant's first assignment of error, which reads as follows:

"The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer numbered III to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that the act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled 'An act to define trusts and to provide for penalties and punishment of corporations, persons, firms and associations of persons connected with them, and to promote free competition in the State of Texas,' approved March 30th, 1889, and articles 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, and 988 of the Penal Code of the State of Texas, based upon said act, are in contravention of that provision of section 1 of article XIV of the amendments of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Statement.

Section 23 of the anti-trust statute of March 30, 1889, (General Laws 1889, page 142) reads as follows:

"SECTION 13. The provisions of this act shall not apply to agricultural products or live stock while in the hands of the producer or raiser."

The substance of this section was carried into the Penal Code of 1895 as article 988.

The grounds of demurrer were in effect (R. 5–6) that the statutes mentioned were in contravention of section 1 of article XIV of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States, because (1) that by reason of section 13 they arbitrarily discriminate against
19 appellant and in favor of the producers and raisers of live stock and agricultural products without any just reason and thereby deny appellant the equal protection of the laws; and (2) the penalties prescribed by the statutes are so excessive and the provisions thereof purporting to define the acts punished are so vague, that appellant is practically denied the right of resort to the judicial tribunals to defend the legality of its acts, except on condition that if not successful, it shall subject all its property to confiscation and forfeit its right to do business in the State.

Authorities.

Connolly *vs.* Union Sewer Pipe Co. 184 U. S., 540;
Cotting *vs.* Kansas City Stock Yards Co. 183 U. S. 79, 83, 99–102.

Second.

The court erred in refusing to sustain appellant's second assignment of error, which reads as follows:

"The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer numbered

IV, to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that the act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled 'An act to define trusts, provide for penalties and punishment of corporations, persons, firms and associations of persons connected with them, and to promote free competition in the State of Texas, and to repeal all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act,' approved April 30th, 1895, and articles 5313, 5314, 5315, 5316, 5317, 5318, 5319, 5320, and 5321, of the Revised Statutes of Texas, and 988*a*, 988*b*, 988c, and 988*d* of the Penal Code of said State, based upon said act of April 30th, 1895, are in contravention of that provision of section 1, article XIV of the amendments of the Constitution of the United States which provides that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the laws."

Statement.

20 Section 12 of the anti-trust statute of April 30th, 1895, (General Laws 1895, p. 115) reads as follows:

"SECTION 12. That the provisions hereof shall be held cumulative of each other and of all other laws in any way affecting them now in force in this State, provided this act shall not be held to apply to live stock and agricultural products in the hands of the producer or raiser; nor shall it be understood or construed to prevent the organization of laborers for the purpose of maintaining any standard of wages."

The substance of this section was carried into the Revised Civil Statutes of 1895 as article 5320.

The grounds of demurrer were in effect (R. 6–7) that the statutes mentioned were in contravention of section 1 of article XIV of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States, because (1) that by reason of section 12 they arbitrarily discriminate against appellant and in favor of the producers and raisers of live stock and agricultural products without any just reason, and thereby deny appellant the equal protection of the laws, and (2) the penalties prescribed by the statutes are so excessive, and the provisions thereof purporting to define the acts punished are so vague that appellant is practically denied the right of resort to the judicial tribunals to defend the legality of its acts except on condition that if not successful, it shall subject all its property to confiscation and forfeit its right to do business in the State.

Authorities.

Connolly *vs.* Union Sewer Pipe Co., 184 U. S. 540
Cotting *vs.* Kansas City Stock Yards Co. 183 U. S., 79, 83, 99–102.

Third.

The court erred in refusing to sustain appellant's third assignment of error, which reads as follows:

"The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer numbered

V to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that the act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled, 'An act to
21 prohibit pools, trusts, monopolies and conspiracies to control business and prices of articles, to prevent the formation or operation of pools, trusts, monopolies and combinations of charters of corporations that violates the terms of this act and to authorize the institution of prosecutions and suits therefor,' approved May 25th, 1899, is in contravention of that provision of section 1 of article XIV of the amendments of the Constitution of the United States which provides that no State shall deprive any person or life, liberty or property without due process of law nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Statement.

The first anti-trust statute of this State, enacted March 30th, 1889 (Gen. Laws 1889, page 141) was entirely supplanted by the act of April 30th, 1895, (Gen. Laws 1895, page 112). But notwithstanding such repeal, the act of March 30th, 1889, was carried as a whole into the Penal Code of 1895, as articles 976–988. The first five sections of the act of April 30th, 1895, are a substantial reproduction of the first five sections of the act of 1889, except that the act of 1895 was extended so as to prohibit agreements creating restrictions in "aids to commerce," and "in the full and free pursuit of any business authorized or permitted by the laws of this State."

Section 6 of the act of 1895 literally reproduces section 1 of the same act, defining trusts, and then prescribes a penalty for those engaged in such combinations. The remaining sections of the act of 1895 are substantial reproductions of corresponding sections of the act of 1889.

Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of the act of 1895 were carried in the Revised Civil Statutes of 1895 as articles 5313, 5314, 5315, 5316, 5317, 5318, 5319, 5320, 5321 and 5321*a*. Sections 6, 7, 8, and 9 were carried into the Penal Code of 1895 as articles 988*a*, 988*b*, 988*c*, and 988*d*. Article 5318 of the Revised Civil Statutes (being section 10 of the act of 1895) was amended by the act of June 5th, 1899, (Gen. Laws 1899, page 310), so as to increase the minimum penalty from $50 to $200 per day, but arti-
22 cles 981 and 988*a* of the Penal Code, which also fixed the minimum penalty for a violation of the act at $50, were not amended; nor did the amendatory act of June 5th, 1899, refer in terms to the anti-trust act of 1895 from section 10 of which article 5318 R. S. was taken.

Section 13 of the act of 1889 provided that said act should not apply to agricultural products or live stock, while in the hands of the producer or raiser, and the same exemption was renewed by section 12 of the act of 1895, with the addition that said act should not be construed to prevent the organization of laborers for the purpose of maintaining any standard of wages. Section 13 of the act of 1889 was carried into and now appears as article 988 of the Penal

Code revised in 1895, and section 12 of the act of 1895 was carried into and now appears as article 5320 of the Revised Civil Statutes of 1895.

The last anti-trust act, that of May 25th, 1899 (Gen. Laws 1899 p. 246) contains no repealing clause, but declares in section 14 that "the provisions of the foregoing sections and the pains and penalties provided for for violations of this act shall be held and construed to be cumulative to all laws now in force in this State."

The demurrer (R. 7–9) was based upon the propositions that the act of 1899 was in violation of section 1 of article XIV of the Constitution of the United States, for the same reasons that the acts of 1889 and 1895 were alleged in the answer to be in contravention thereof because, as set forth by the demurrer, the act of 1899 was, by its terms, cumulative and a mere supplement to and *in pari materia* with the acts of 1889 and 1895 and the Civil and Penal Code based on said acts.

Authorities.

Connolly *vs.* Union Sewer Pipe Co., 184 U. S., 540
Cotting *vs.* Kansas City Stock Yard Co. 183 U. S., 79, 83, 99–102.
Cain *vs.* State, 20 Tex., 362,
Shelby *vs.* Johnson, Dallam, 597,
Bryan *vs.* Sundberry, 5 Tex., 355, 362,
Selman *vs.* Wolff, 27 Tex., 70,
23 Hanrick *vs.* Hanrick, 54 Texas, 103,
Alexander *vs.* Mayor, 5 Cranch, 1,
Patterson *vs.* Winn, 11 Wheaton, 380, 385.
Ryan *vs.* Carter, 93 U. S., 78, 84.
Dwarris on Statutes, Potter's edition, p. 189,
Sutherland on Statutory Construction, section 288
Pierce *vs.* Atwood, 13 Mass., 324, 344.
Reg *vs.* Tonbridge, Overseers, L. R. 13, Q. B. Div., 342.

Fourth.

This court erred in refusing to sustain appellant's fourth assignment of error, which reads as follows:

"The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer, numbered VI, to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that the act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled, 'An act to prohibit pools, trusts, monopolies and conspiracies to control business and prices of articles, to prevent the formation or operation of pools, trusts, monopolies and combinations of charters of corporations that violates the terms of this act, and to authorize the institution of prosecutions and suits therefor,' approved May 25th, 1899, is in contravention of section 35 of article III of the constitution of the State of Texas.

Statement.

The title of the anti-trust act of May 25th, 1899, is as follows: "An act to prohibit pools, trusts, monopolies and conspiracies to control business and prices of articles; to prevent the formation or operation of pools, trusts, monopolies and combinations of charters of corporations that violates the terms of this act and to authorize the institution of prosecutions and suits therefor."

Authorities.

Constitution of 1876, article III, section 35.

24 Fifth.

This court erred in refusing to sustain appellant's fifth and sixth assignments of error which in effect present the same point, and were therefore briefed and argued together and as presenting the single proposition that the combination alleged is not illegal under the common law, and even if it were, the State is not entitled to forfeit the license of appellant therefor.

Authorities.

Queen Ins. Co. *vs.* State, 86 Texas, 250, 274–275.

Appellant reports that Honorable Charles K. Bell, attorney general of the State of Texas, and Honorable Warren W. Moore, district attorney of the 26th and 53rd judicial districts of Texas, are counsel herein for appellee, The State of Texas, and that they both reside in the city of Austin in Travis county, Texas.

Wherefore, appellant prays that notice be served upon counsel for appellee as provided by law and that in consideration hereof the judgment heretofore rendered in this cause be set aside and a rehearing herein be granted.

BAKER, BOTTS, BAKER & LOVETT AND
HUTCHESON, CAMPBELL & HUTCHESON,
Attorneys for The Southern Cotton Oil Co., Appellant.

(Endorsed:) Mo. 1565. Southern Cotton Oil Company, appellant, *vs.* State of Texas. Motion for rehearing. Filed in court of civil appeals, 3rd supreme judicial district, Austin, Texas, Feb. 17, 1903. R. H. Connerly, clerk. Filed in supreme court Mar. 31, 1903. F. T. Connerly, clerk.

25 *Order Submitting Motion for Rehearing.*

Made February 25th, 1903.

Motion 1565.

SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY
vs.
STATE OF TEXAS. } No. 2927.

Appeal from Travis county.

Motion for a rehearing: Submitted.

Order Overruling Motion for Rehearing.

Made March 4th, 1903.

Motion 1565.

SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY
vs.
STATE OF TEXAS. } No. 2927.

Appeal from Travis county.

Motion for a rehearing: The motion is overruled.

26 *Judgment of Supreme Court.*

In Supreme Court of Texas.

THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL CO.
vs.
THE STATE OF TEXAS. } 3rd District.

APRIL 2ND, 1903.

This day came on to be heard the application of the Southe Cotton Oil Co. for a writ of error to the court of civil appeals for t third district, and the same having been duly considered, it is o dered that said application be refused; that the applicant, T Southern Cotton Oil Company and its sureties I. W. Walker a Howard F. Smith, pay all costs incurred on this application.

I, F. T. Connerly, clerk of the supreme court of Texas, herel certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the judgme rendered by said court on said application for a writ of error.

Witness my hand and the seal of said court, this the 18th day April, A. D. 1903.

[SEAL.]

F. T. CONNERLY, *Clerk*,
By J. S. MYRICK, *Deputy*.

(Endorsed:) Application No. 3728. The Southern Cotton Oil Co. *vs.* The State of Texas. Copy of judgment in supreme court. Application for writ of error refused. Filed in court of civil appeals, 3rd supreme judicial district, Austin, Texas, Apr. 18, 1903. R. H. Connerly, clerk.

27 *Bill of Costs of Supreme Court.*

Bill of costs of supreme court of Texas.

Clerk's Office, Supreme Court.

THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL CO. *vs.* THE STATE OF TEXAS. } No. 3728. Certified Copy of Bill of Costs, Supreme Court.

Filing application	.50
Docketing petition	.50
Entering appearance of counsel	.50
Filing two briefs	.60
Filing three papers	.90
Entering orders	.50
Entering judgment on application	1.00
Certified copy of judgment	1.00
Taxing costs of application	.50
Certified copy of bill of costs	1.00
Total	$7.00

I, F. T. Connerly, clerk of the supreme court of Texas, hereby certify that the above copy of the original bill of costs is true and correct.

Witness my hand and seal of said court at Austin, this the 18th day of April, 1903.

[SEAL.] F. T. CONNERLY, *Clerk.*

(Endorsed:) Application No. 3728. Certified copy bill of costs in supreme court, Austin. The Southern Cotton Oil Co. *vs.* The State of Texas. $7.00. Filed in court of civil appeals, 3rd supreme judicial district, Austin, Texas, Apr. 18, 1903. R. H. Connerly, clerk.

28 *Writ of Error Bond.*

Know all men by these presents, that we, The Southern Cotton Oil Company, I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith, as principals and E. A. Peden and A. Breyer, as sureties, are held and firmly bound unto the State of Texas in the full and just sum of five thousand dollars, to be paid to the said State of Texas, its successors or assigns, for which payment, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, and each of us, our and each of our heirs, executors and administrators jointly and severally by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this 15 day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and three.

Whereas, lately, at a term of the court of civil appeals in and for the third supreme judicial district of Texas in a suit pending in said court between The Southern Cotton Oil Company, appellant, and The State of Texas, appellee, a judgment was rendered against The Southern Cotton Oil Company, appellant, and against I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith, the sureties on its appeal bond, and The Southern Cotton Oil Company and said I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith having obtained a writ of error, and filed a copy thereof in the clerk's office of said court to reverse the judgment in the aforesaid suit, and a citation directed to the said State of Texas citing and admonishing said State to be and appear at a Supreme Court of the United States, to be holden at Washington within thirty days from the date hereof.

Now the condition of the above obligation is such that if said The Southern Cotton Oil Company, I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith shall prosecute their writ of error to effect and answer all damages and costs if they fail to make their plea good, then the above obligation to be void; else to remain in full force and virtue.

THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY,
I. W. WALKER, AND
HOWARD F. SMITH,
29 By BAKER, BOTTS, BAKER & LOVETT AND
HUTCHESON, CAMPBELL & HUTCHESON,
Their Attorneys of Record.

E. A. PEDEN, *Surety.*
A. BREYER, *Surety.*

STATE OF TEXAS, }
County of Harris. }

I, Henry Albrecht, clerk of the district court in and for said county of Harris, do hereby certify that E. A. Peden and A. Breyer, whose names appear signed to the annexed bond are in my opinion good and ample security for the amount therein specified and that if said bond was offered to me for approval, the same would be accepted and approved.

To certify which, I hereunto set my hand and official seal this 10th day of April, 1903.

[SEAL.] HENRY ALBRECHT,
Clerk District Court, Harris County, Texas,
By T. W. BROWNE, *Deputy.*

Approved this 22nd day of April, 1903.

H. C. FISHER,
Chief Justice Court Civil Appeals, 3rd Supreme Judicial Dist., Texas.

(Endorsed:) No. 2927. The Southern Cotton Oil Company *vs* The State of Texas. Writ of error bond. Filed in court of civil appeals, 3rd supreme judicial district, Austin, Texas, Apr. 22, 1903. R. H. Connerly, clerk.

30 *Duplicate Writ of Error.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *ss:*

The President of the United States of America to the honorable the judges of the court of civil appeals in and for the third supreme judicial district of Texas, Greeting:

Because in the record and proceedings, as also in the rendition of the judgment of a plea which is in the said court of civil appeals in and for the third supreme judicial district of Texas before you, or some of you, being the highest court of said State in which a decision could be had in the said suit between The Southern Cotton Oil Company, appellant, and I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith, its sureties, and The State of Texas, appellee, wherein was drawn in question the validity of a treaty or statute of, or an authority exercised under the United States, and the decision was against their validity; or wherein was drawn in question the validity of a statute of, or an authority exercised under a State on the ground of their being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties or laws of the United States, and the decision was in favor of their validity; or wherein a title, right, privilege or immunity was claimed under the Constitution or a treaty or statute of, or commission held or authority exercised under the United States, and the decision was against the title, right, privilege or immunity specially set up or claimed under such Constitution, treaty, statute, commission or authority, a manifest error hath happened to the great damage of the Southern Cotton Oil Company, I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith, as by their complaint appears, we, being willing that error, if any hath been, should be duly corrected and full and speedy justice done to the parties aforesaid, in this behalf do command you, if judgment be therein given, that then and under your seal distinctly and openly you send the record and proceedings aforesaid, with all things concerning the same,
31 to the Supreme Court of the United States, together with this writ, so that you have the same in the said Supreme Court at Washington within thirty days from the date hereof that the record and proceedings aforesaid being inspected, the said Supreme Court may cause further to be done therein to correct that error what of right and according to the laws and customs of the United States should be done.

Witness the Honorable Melville W. Fuller, Chief Justice of the United States, this *22d* day of *April*, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and three.

[SEAL.]

D. H. HART,
Clerk Circuit Court of the United States,
Western District of Texas.
By J. W. HANCOCK, *Deputy.*

Allowed:

H. C. FISHER,
Chief Justice Court of Civil Appeals in and for
the Third Supreme Judicial District of Texas.

(Endorsed:) No. 2927. The Southern Cotton Oil Company *vs.* The State of Texas. Writ of error. Duplicate. Filed in court of civil appeals, 3rd supreme judicial district, Austin, Texas, Apr. 22, 1903. R. H. Connerly, clerk.

Assignment of Errors.

In the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District.

THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY
vs.
THE STATE OF TEXAS. } No. 2927.

Now come plaintiffs in error, The Southern Cotton Oil Company, I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith, and on writ of error from
32 the Supreme Court of the United States say that in the record and proceedings in said cause the said court of civil appeals erred:

First. In failing to sustain and in overruling plaintiff in error's first assignment of error, reading as follows: "The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer, numbered III, to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that the act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled 'An act to define trusts and to provide for penalties and punishment of corporations, persons, firms and associations of persons connected with them, and to promote free competition in the State of Texas,' approved March 30th, 1889, and articles 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983. 984, 985, 986, 987 and 988 of the Penal Code of the State of Texas, based upon said act, are in contravention of that provision of section 1, of article XIV of the amendments of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Second. In failing to sustain and in overruling plaintiff in error's second assignment of error, reading as follows: "The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer numbered IV, to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that the act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled 'An act to define trusts, provide for penalties and punishment of corporations, persons, firms and associations of persons connected with them, and to promote free competition in the State of Texas, and to repeal all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act,' approved April 30th, 1895, and articles 5313, 5314, 5315, 5316, 5317, 5318, 5319, 5320 and 5321 of the Revised Statutes of Texas, and 988*a*, 988*b*, 988*c*, and 988*d* of the Penal Code of said State, based upon said act of April 30th, 1895, are in contravention of that provision of section 1, article XIV, of the amendments of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that no
33 State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the laws."

Third. In failing to sustain and in overruling plaintiff in error's third assignment of error reading as follows: "The court erred in overruling defendant's demurrer numbered V, to plaintiff's petition, based upon the ground that the act of the legislature of the State of Texas, entitled 'An act to prohibit pools, trusts, monopolies and conspiracies to control business and prices of articles, to prevent the formation or operation of pools, trusts, monopolies and combinations of charters of corporations that violates the terms of this act, and to authorize the institution of prosecutions and suits therefor,' approved May 25th, 1899, is in contravention of that provision of section 1, of article XIV, of the amendments of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Fourth. In affirming the judgment of the district court and not reversing said judgment.

Wherefore, plaintiffs in error pray that the judgment of said court of civil appeals be reversed and that said cause be remanded, and for such other proceedings as law and justice may require.

J. C. HUTCHESON,
ROBERT S. LOVETT,
HUTCHESON, CAMPBELL & HUTCHESON,
BAKER, BOTTS, BAKER & LOVETT,
Attorneys for The Southern Cotton Oil Company, I. W. Walker, and Howard F. Smith, Plaintiffs in Error.

(Endorsed:) No. 2927. The Southern Cotton Oil Company *vs.* The State of Texas. Assignment of errors. Filed in court of civil appeals, 3rd supreme judicial district, Austin, Texas, Apr. 22, 1903. R. H. Connerly, clerk.

34

Bill of Costs of Court of Civil Appeals.

THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY *vs.* THE STATE OF TEXAS. } No. 2927.

Appeal from Travis county.

Filing record	.50
Docketing cause	.50
Appearances	1.00
Filing briefs	.80
Filing and entering motion	.35
Orders	2.00
Filing seven extra papers	.70
Judgment	1.00
Taxing costs and copy	.50
Mandate	1.50

Recording opinion	.5
Certified copy bill of costs	.7
Certified copy orders to sup. court of Texas	2.0
Costs of supreme court of Texas	7.0
Notices	4.5
Copy of motion	5.8
Issuing two precepts	2.0
Sheriff's fees	2.0
Transcript fee to U. S. Supreme Court	14.4
Total	$47.8

35 *Clerk's Certificate.*

Certificate of clerk of court of civil appeals.

Clerk's office, court of civil appeals, Austin, Texas.

I, R. H. Connerly, clerk of the court of civil appeals, 3rd suprem judicial district of Texas, hereby certify that the foregoing 34 page contain a true and correct copy of all proceedings had in the dis trict court of Travis county, 53rd judicial district of Texas, in th court of civil appeals of the third supreme judicial district of Texas and in the supreme court of the State of Texas, as the same appea from the papers and files of record in my office, in cause No. 2927 The Southern Cotton Oil Company *vs.* The State of Texas, on appea from Travis county.

Witness my hand and the seal of said court, at office at Austin Texas, this the 7th day of May, A. D. 1903.

[Seal Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Texas.]

R. H. CONNERLY, *Clerk.*

36 In the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District.

THE SOUTHERN COTTON OIL COMPANY *vs.* THE STATE OF TEXAS. } No. 2927.

To any justice of the Supreme Court of the United States or th chief justice of the court of civil appeals in and for the third supreme judicial district of Texas:

Petitioners, The Southern Cotton Oil Company and I. W. Walke and Howard F. Smith, respectfully represent that in the above en titled cause then pending therein on appeal from the district cour of Travis county in and for the fifty-third judicial district of Texas and wherein petitioner, The Southern Cotton Oil Company was th only party appellant, and petitioners, I. W. Walker and Howard F

Smith, were sureties on its appeal bond, and The State of Texas was the only appellee, the court of civil appeals in and for the third supreme judicial district of Texas, on the fourth day of February, 1903, affirmed a judgment and decree in said cause rendered on the second day of June, 1902, by the district court of Travis county in and for the fifty-third judicial district of Texas, in favor of the State of Texas, as plaintiff, and against petitioner, The Southern Cotton Oil Company, as defendant, in said district court and rendered judgment against the said I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith, sureties, as well as against petitioner, The Southern Cotton Oil Company, for all costs of suit. That thereafter, and in due time, petitioner, The Southern Cotton Oil Company, filed in the said court of civil appeals its motion for rehearing, which motion was, on the 4th day of March, 1903, by said court overruled and denied; and
37 thereafter, and in due time said petitioner applied in due form and as authorized by law to the supreme court of the State of Texas for a writ of error in said cause to the said court of civil appeals, which application was thereafter, to-wit, on the 2nd day of April, 1903, by said supreme court denied and the writ of error prayed for by said petitioner refused, whereupon the said judgment of the said court of civil appeals, which is the highest court of the said State in which a decision in said suit could be had, became and is final.

And petitioners say that they are aggrieved by the said judgment and the proceedings in said suit, and that in the said judgment and proceedings had prior thereunto in said cause errors were committed to the prejudice of petitioners because they say there was in said suit drawn in question the validity of statutes of and an authority exercised under a State on the ground of their being repugnant to the Constitution and laws of the United States, and the decision was in favor of their validity; and that titles, rights, privileges and immunities were in said suit claimed by petitioner under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, and the decision in said suit was against the titles, rights, privileges and immunities specially set up and claimed therein by petitioners under such Constitution and statutes, as will more fully appear from the demurrers numbered III, IV and V of petitioner, The Southern Cotton Oil Company as contained in its original answer in said suit to plaintiff's petition therein, and as will further appear from the first, second and third errors assigned by said petitioner in the said court of civil appeals, and as will also appear from the motion for rehearing filed by said petitioner in said court of civil appeals, and from the assignment of errors filed herewith and which petitioners pray your honors to read as a part hereof.

Your petitioners refer to the assignment of errors filed herewith and pray that the same be considered for the purposes of this petition as a part hereof, and further pray that a writ of error may be allowed and issued herein to the said court of civil appeals in and

for the third supreme judicial district of Texas, which now
38 has the record in said suit, for the removal of said cause into the Supreme Court of the United States to the end that the errors in said judgment and proceedings in said cause may be duly corrected and full and speedy justice done to the parties aforesaid in this behalf, and that the transcript of the record, proceedings and papers in said cause duly authenticated may be sent to the said Supreme Court of the United States.

J. C. HUTCHESON,
ROBERT S. LOVETT,
HUTCHESON, CAMPBELL & HUTCHESON,
BAKER, BOTTS, BAKER & LOVETT,
Attorneys for The Southern Cotton Oil Company, I. W. Walker, and Howard F. Smith, Petitioners.

Allowed on this 22d day of April, 1903, with supersedeas upon furnishing bond in the sum of five thousand dollars, conditioned as the law directs.

H. C. FISHER,
Chief Justice of the Court of Civil Appeals of the Third Supreme Judicial District of Texas.

39 [Endorsed:] No. 2927. The Southern Cotton Oil Company *vs.* The State of Texas. Application for writ of error. Filed in court of civil appeals, 3rd supreme judicial district, Austin, Texas. Apr. 22 1903 R. H. Connerly, clerk.

40 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *ss:*

The President of the United States of America to the honorable the judges of the court of civil appeals in and for the third supreme judicial district of Texas, Greeting:

Because in the record and proceedings, as also in the rendition of the judgment of a plea which is in the said court of civil appeals in and for the third supreme judicial district of Texas before you, or some of you, being the highest court of said State in which a decision could be had in the said suit between The Southern Cotton Oil Company, appellant, and I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith, its sureties, and The State of Texas, appellee, wherein was drawn in question the validity of a treaty or statute of, or an authority exercised under the United States, and the decision was against their validity; or wherein was drawn in question the validity of a statute of, or an authority exercised under a State, on the ground of their being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties or laws of the United States, and the decision was in favor of their validity; or wherein a title, right, privilege or immunity was claimed under the Constitution or a treaty or statute of, or commission held or authority exercised under the United States and the decision was against the title, right, privilege or immunity specially set up or claimed under such Constitution, treaty, statute, commission or authority, a manifest

error hath happened to the great damage of The Southern Cotton Oil Company, I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith, as by their complaint appears, we, being willing that error, if any hath been, should be duly corrected and full and speedy justice done to the parties aforesaid, in this behalf, do command you, if judgment be therein given, that then and under your seal distinctly and openly you send the record and proceedings aforesaid, with all things concerning the same, to the Supreme Court of the United States, together with this writ, so that you have the same in the said Supreme Court
41 at Washington within thirty days from the date hereof that the record and proceedings aforesaid being inspected the said Supreme Court may cause further to be done therein to correct that error what of right and according to the laws and customs of the United States should be done.

Witness the Honorable Melville W. Fuller, Chief Justice of the United States, this 22 day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and three.

[The Seal of the U. S. Circuit Court, Western Dist. Texas, Austin.]

D. H. HART,
Clerk Circuit Court of the United States,
Western District of Texas,
By J. W. HANCOCK, *Deputy.*

Allowed:
H. C. FISHER,
Chief Justice of the Court of Civil Appeals in and for the Third Supreme Judicial District of Texas.

42 [Endorsed:] No. 2927. The Southern Cotton Oil Company vs. The State of Texas. Writ of error. Original. Filed in court of civil appeals 3rd supreme judicial district, Austin, Texas. Apr. 22 1903 R. H. Connerly, clerk.

43 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *ss:*

To the State of Texas, Greeting:

You are hereby cited and admonished to be and appear at a Supreme Court of the United States, at Washington, within thirty days from the date hereof pursuant to a writ of error filed in the clerk's office of the court of civil appeals in and for the third supreme judicial district of Texas, wherein The Southern Cotton Oil Company, I. W. Walker and Howard F. Smith are plaintiffs in error, and you are defendant in error, to show cause, if any there be, why the judgment rendered against said plaintiffs in error, as in said writ of error mentioned, should not be corrected, and why speedy justice should not be done to the parties in that behalf.

Witness the Honorable Melville W. Fuller, Chief Justice of the

United States, this 22d day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and three.

H. C. FISHER,
Chief Justice of the Court of Civil Appeals for the Third Supreme Judicial District of Texas.

Attest with seal of the circuit court of the United States for the western district of Texas, this April 22, A. D. 1903.

[The Seal of the U. S. Circuit Court, Western Dist. Texas, Austin.]

D. H. HART,
Clerk of said Circuit Court,
By J. W. HANCOCK.

44 [Endorsed:] No. 2927. The Southern Cotton Oil Company *vs.* The State of Texas. Citation. Filed in court of civil appeals 3rd supreme judicial district, Austin, Texas. Apr. 24 1903 R. H. Connerly, clerk.

Due service of the above and foregoing citation is hereby acknowledged
This April 24, 1903

S. W. T. LANHAM,
Governor of Texas.
C. K. BELL,
Att'y Gen'l of Texas.

[Endorsed:] No. —. Southern Cotton Oil Company *vs.* State of Texas.

Endorsed on cover: File No. 18,935. Texas court of civil appeals, 3rd supreme judicial court. Term No. 707. The Southern Cotton Oil Company *et al.*, plaintiff- in error, *vs.* The State of Texas. Filed May 15th, 1903.